

97-84035-29

Rye, Walter

Dr. J. Horace Round and
his recent attack on...

Norwich

1922

97-84035-29
MASTER NEGATIVE #


COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z [Rye, Walter, 1843-1929.
Box 108 Dr. J. Horace Round and his recent attack on Mr.
Walter Rye, as to the Colchester chronicle, Nor-
wich castle and other matters. Norwich, Roberts,
1922.
42 p. 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ cm.

Signed: Walter Rye.

28002 
ONLY ED

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35 mm

REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1

IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-4-97

INITIALS: ms

TRACKING # : 22352

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Box
Through the President's Office

Dr. J. HORACE ROUND

AND HIS

RECENT ATTACK

ON

Mr. WALTER RYE

308

Z

Box 108

As to the Colchester Chronicle,
Norwich Castle and
other matters

Privately Printed.

NORWICH :

Roberts & Co., Ten Bell Lane

1922

Dr. J. HORACE ROUND

AND HIS

RECENT ATTACK

ON

Mr. WALTER RYE

As to the Colchester Chronicle,
Norwich Castle and
other matters

Privately Printed.

NORWICH :

Roberts & Co., Ten Bell Lane
1922

Dr. J. Horace Round and his Recent Attack on Mr. Walter Rye.

CHAPTER I.

In the "English Historical Review" of January, 1922, is an article of 34 pages by Dr. J. Horace Round violently assailing me and my accuracy in general, and in particular a pamphlet I had just issued on Norwich Castle, which contained an attempted vindication of the Chronicle of St. John's Abbey, Colchester. As it is impossible for me to reply to it in the paper in which it appeared, I have no alternative but to do so by pamphlet, as two of my fellow victims did on similar occasions.

For many years I have corresponded with Dr. Round and have managed to keep on more or less amicable terms with him, and he has, from time to time, been graciously pleased to approve of my efforts in destructive criticism, which began, by the way, long before he followed on the same lines.

He was almost too eulogistic in the "Quarterly" as to my attack on the Howard pedigree, called me a well-known critical genealogist in his "Peerage and Family History," p. 134, and agreed with me as to the fiction of Cromwell's Royal descent, and as to the Stewart, the Poer, Wiggett, Bulwer, and Buxton families elsewhere in other of his publications.

Forty-two years ago (when I knew even less than I do now) in dealing with the very confused pedigree of Clere, of Ormesby in the "Genealogist" (O.S., vol IV., page 99, 1880), I conjectured it might have come from the baronial family of Clare, and made the mistake of thinking that Robert Fitz Walter, of Horsford, was identical with another and later Robert Fitz Walter, a somewhat venial error.

In my "Norfolk Families" (1913, p. 105) I said "It is not, however, impossible, and indeed I think it highly probable, that this family may be descended from the noble family."

This mistake having remained undetected for so many years, I repeated it in my "Coat Armour in Norfolk before 1563" (1917-1918, Index, page 93).

Then Dr. Round found out my mistake of 1880, and I need hardly say, made the most of it in his letters to me.

Next I was guilty of the unpardonable sin of finding out his terrible mistake in his "Geoffrey de Mandeville," which I will detail hereafter.

Following on this and on another difference I had with him as to Castle guard services, his letters became so unpleasant and unfairly critical that in 1920 I ventured privately to protest against what I considered his unsportsmanlike treatment of myself and others, and on one occasion I wrote, "I apparently can't get into your head the gross unfairness of your continually carping at the incorrectness of what I wrote some 35 years ago" (as to the Clares and Cleres), and on another occasion, "I fear we shall never agree that it is unsportsmanlike to jump again and again on a man who has admitted himself beaten and practically put his hands down," this referring to the same old admitted error.

Then the band began to play and his retaliation started at once. In the "English Historical Review," of October, 1920, in an article purporting to be on "The Early Sheriffs of Norfolk," page 485, he made a most unjustifiable attack on me as to my identification of the baronial family of Clare with the minor family of Clere, of Ormesby, which I suggested 42 years ago in which I made an error I have since twice admitted†

†His methods are indeed utterly unscrupulous and unsportsmanlike. For him no Statute of Limitations runs. My Clere error was primarily made 42 years ago, and the Red Book of the Exchequer came out over 25 years ago, but he has never ceased to abuse its editor on every possible occasion, and on the most transparent excuses. He is like a dog with a favourite bone which he buries and brings up again.

Yet though he well knew of my admissions of error he wrote in the article just cited that "Although he knows that the Clares, a great Baronial house, were quite distinct from the Cleres, a local Norfolk family, he asserts, etc."

This was a wholly unjustifiable insinuation against my good faith and I showed it to be so in what I think everyone will agree was a very moderate article which I sent to the Editor of the "English Historical Review." In the days of former editors it would, of course, have been inserted. The present editor, however, declined to do so, and merely inserted a few words of protest from me, but the Editor of the "Genealogist" (which Dr. Round himself, "Peerage and Pedigree" ii., p. 239, describes as the recognised organ of genealogists) inserted it in his issue for April, 1921.

In this reply I again admitted an error which I had made nearly 42 years ago, only stating of him that he was not justified in making such a statement about me and I went on to give facts to show that the Cleres held in three places of the Clares, and so were probably a junior branch of that family. This last paper Dr. Round has not answered, nor has he denied the facts I gave. All he does is to reiterate on p. 31 his old story and his old abuse.

This made matters still worse between us and I unluckily at this time issued the hastily printed pamphlet on Norwich Castle which has provided him with so many errors to gird at. As to this pamphlet see footnote‡

‡I can only admit that it is as full of trivial misprints as an egg is of meat. My excuse is that while I was seeing it through the press in newspaper serial form, I was in very bad health (I see I wrote Dr. Round on the 27th July, 1920, that "I had been seriously ill with heart disease and confined to my bed for a long while, and that the doctor and I both thought it was a of 'diem clausit extremum'"). And I was actually under treatment for incipient glaucoma, which accounts for much bad writing and worse proof reading.

Being thus, as I thought, nearly sped, I remembered that I had a box full of notes on Norwich Castle, containing a vindication of the Colchester Chronicle, the accumulation of many years, and I thought it would be a pity if I did not print

DR. J. H. ROUND'S RECENT ATTACK ON MR. WALTER RYE

Immediately following the publication of this pamphlet, which seems to have greatly enraged him, he wrote to me:

"As you always pride yourself so much on your sportsmanship[†] you must be familiar with the phrase 'asking for trouble,' that is what you have yourself done." And added "this reply however is so crushingly decisive that it will not only decide the status of the Chronicle, but will settle the question of your own accuracy once for all beyond the possibility of reply."

This open declaration of war against me is I think sufficient proof of the real reason for his 34 pp. of abusive corrections.

To this I replied that I awaited his article with interest and hoped it would appear in some paper which would have the decency to allow me the right of reply—not to suppress it as my answer to his most uncalled for attack on me as to the Cleres had been suppressed.

I need hardly say that the decency I asked for never materialized, and the abusive article of which I complain, which can only be called spiteful in the extreme, duly appeared in the "English Historical Review" of January, 1922.

Of course it would have been a waste of postage to send the following paper to the "English Historical Review" after the way the editor had treated me in my very

them *quant. val.* By arrangement with two local papers I did so in serial form, the Norwich Castle part in a Norfolk paper, the Colchester part in an Essex paper. The former was printed week by week, and, of course, I had next to no time for careful correction of proofs. This resulted in very many misprints which I admit and regret, but the amusing part is that the lynx eye of Dr. Round never noticed the two worst of them.

[†]This, no doubt, referred to my former protest against his unsportsmanlike conduct. It is a pity he never did go in for sport. With his flow of vituperative language (for samples see Appendix) he would, after a few technical phrases picked up on the tow-path, have made a coxswain for the O.U.B.C. capable of extracting an extra two lengths from a suffering crew from P. to M.

DR. J. H. ROUND'S RECENT ATTACK ON MR. WALTER RYE¹

mild Clere paper—so like other sufferers at his hands I can only retaliate by pamphlet. As Dr. Round's attack on me was avowedly made to injure me and my reputation, it was, of course, a gross libel for which I could have sued him, but at the age of 79 I had no inclination to waste some hundreds of pounds by suing a rich man for a possible farthing's damage.

On going through the article carefully, however, I note that about four-fifths of it are devoted to corrections and criticisms of various minor sins and omissions (many of them obvious misprints), of which he states I have been guilty on various subjects, during the last half century. The list might have been longer, for he has missed many errors I have discovered for myself, but it is only given on the general principle of "no case but abuse the plaintiff's attorney." The mistakes specified have absolutely no more bearing on the question of the reliability of the Colchester Chronicle than the crushing statement of Dickens' old lady, "There are milestones on the Dover road—let him answer that if he can."

Whether his reply is so "crushingly decisive" as he thinks is another matter which I will leave to my readers, for when we come to analyse it we find that on all important points he simply evades my statements and ignores all the arguments put forward in support of my views. He refers to the "Legend" of Eudo dapifer, but surely his history, supported by over 70 charters, set out on pages 5-9 of my "Norwich Castle" is too well substantiated to be called a legend.

As I said before, however, I fancy the chief reason for Dr. Round's animus against me is the fact that I had privately convicted him of a colossal and far reaching error, viz., that in his "Geoffrey de Mandeville," page 173, he said that the statement of Dugdale as to Geoffrey de Mandeville being maternally a grandson of Eudo dapifer, whose daughter and heiress had married his father William was derived solely from the *Historia Foundationis of St. John's Abbey, Colchester.*

I had some difficulty in getting him privately to admit it, for at first he tried to explain the fact by referring to the old edition of the "Monasticon," though that edition also does not include the Mandeville statement at all. Ultimately, after much correspondence, he had to admit that it occurred not in the Colchester, but in the Tintern Chronicle! I found that this was the case, but did not think it necessary to do more than mention the fact very cursorily in my Norwich Castle pamphlet without gloating over his error, as I might have done. To this day he has never admitted in print his terrible initial error—the exposure of which, I contend, was really a great cause of his bitterness.

Before going into the few real questions between us, which I will deal with in chapter 2, it may be as well to refer to two or three of the other trivial charges of inaccuracy he makes against me, which have absolutely no bearing on the subject with which he is supposed to be dealing.

The chief errors which Dr. Round did notice were :

1. That the printer *sub* 1362 made me insert Sir John Howard as Constable in I. Ed. IV., as well as mentioning him in his proper place later on in 1464. Surely he does not seriously accuse me of thinking that I. Ed. IV. was 1362. The error arose from a slip in which the printer misread my 1462 for 1362, and printed it in the wrong place.

2. That in referring to the authoress of "Armitage's Early Norman Castles," I called her "Miss" and not Mrs. I To her, and not to him, I apologise, only pointing out that there is nothing on the face of the work to show whether she was one or the other, and that "Who's Who" had then no notice of her. I was probably misled by the fact that practically all previous lady writers on historical and antiquarian subjects, such as Miss Strickland, "Hermentrude," Miss Toulmin Smith, Miss Kate Norgate, Miss Hoare, and Miss Jeffries Davis, the present University Reader in History, were unmarried when they found time for the deep research necessary for their valuable works—time which I thought could not have been given by a married lady.

3. Then I am called over the coals for a slip by which, on one occasion, my printer made me call Miss Kate Norgate, the authoress of the "Angevin Kings," "Mr." Norgate instead of "Miss" Norgate. Considering that she was a Norwich lady, surely I, as a local antiquary, might have been credited with knowing that she was a woman, the more especially as I describe her rightly on page 18 and in my index!

What on earth have these three errors† to do with Eudo dapifer, and the authenticity of the Colchester Chronicle? They are only dragged in to try to show my inaccuracy. If such methods as these are the way to write History, I can only be grateful that I am only a local topographer.

4. One of the worst instances of the padding with which he makes up much of his 34 pages of abuse is his reference to the late Mr. Chester Waters, who was an early attacker of the Chronicle. He gives an example of Mr. Waters extreme inaccuracy on page 27n, but seems mentally incapable of seeing that by doing so he is actually aiding my argument that he was an unreliable critic.

I suppose he thought it useful to show someone was wrong, and hoped that the casual reader would think it was I!

5. As to his accusing me of erring as to Freeman, it is really amusing to see the very man, who has done more than anyone else to destroy what reputation Freeman ever had as a historian (see Appendix under F), turn round and use him as the stick to beat me with! All that I knew was that in one of the books, Freeman absolutely doubted and ridiculed Wace's story of the saving of William's life, which is now admitted by everyone (see Norwich Castle, pages 33-44), and had tried to be funny in a ponderous way on the story and then afterwards he turned round and said something totally different.

† Does Dr. Round not make similar slips himself, e.g., when he often calls Dr. Dukinfield Astley, Mr. Dukinfield Astley?

I may have confused this *volte face* with another, but do not propose to waste space on the matter. It has nothing whatever to do with the Colchester Chronicle (which does not mention this episode at all), and is only dragged in by Dr. Round to show in detail how inaccurate I am. But I would point out that after he had demolished Freeman's reputation it is a little inconsistent to quote that author's views on the Chronicle as having any value.

6. On page 20 he makes the most disingenuous statement that, while referring to Freeman's amazing error (V., page 72) that Jews were not mentioned in England before the time of William Rufus, I depended on such names as Manasses and Samson being found in Domesday. It will hardly be believed that my actual words (Norwich Castle, page 37) were "He did not know that Joseph and Solaman were tenants T.R.E. in Oxford and York, and that Isaac, Jacob, Manasses, Moyses, Solaman and Samson were undertenants named in Domesday."

I named 10 cases, and he retorts that two of them might have been Christians!

If he does not deny that Freeman was utterly wrong in his statement why did he attack me on this point at all.

Roughly speaking he has made 60 accusations and criticisms of my various statements. I have just dealt with six of them, and to the main points, which I contend are still open, I will reply in my next chapter. Most of the others are extremely trivial and in most cases obviously misprints. Where he has scored is on page 13 where he convicts me of writing E. Chepe when I meant W. Chepe, and where he points out the non-identity of William de Archis with William de Pont de L'Arche. This is wrong, and I ought to have known it was, for Mr. Davis in his "Regesta" gave cross references which prove me wrong.

On more than one occasion he rightly points out that my printer has referred to this excellent work as Regist. (page 3). This is very sad, but this again has no great bearing on the authenticity of the Colchester Chronicle.

I must also plead guilty to "utter carelessness" in misprints such as £161 8s. for £16 18s., but anyone conversant with the ways of a lino machine will understand how it arose. Nor is the misspelling of Jordan de Fantosme's name of vital importance. My reference to Goscelin the intermediary as being sent by Edward to William (page 27) instead of *vice versa* is a bona-fide slip, so is my giving the date of Henry I. as 1100-54 which was very slipshod on my part. The very great part of the emendations and corrections are trivial in the extreme and are mostly obvious printer's errors. Many of the others are absolute repetitions of the same thing and ought not to be counted twice in adding up the score. Others are to me confused and unintelligible and do not affect the real question of the reliability of the Chronicle. With these real points I will deal in my next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

I will now deal with the reliability of the Colchester Chronicle which is really the only matter in the dispute which is of importance to historical students. Dr. Round thinks (in letter of 5th December, 1921) that his article is "crushingly decisive" against the Chronicle, in fact, he has said it so frequently (following the precedent of the Snark) that he seems to think that what he tells us three times must be true.

On the other hand I contend that there is no Monastic Chronicle in existence which is so well substantiated by extraneous evidence as this one.

If it did not actually inspire Dr. Round with the descent of Eudo's wife it certainly confirmed his views, for in "Feudal England," page 470, he quotes it as being the sole evidence for the real parentage of Bishop William Giffard, and lower down on the same page, while dealing with another point, he wrote, "But we must decide in favour of the Colchester narrative."† But he can't keep himself from abusing and ridiculing it, e.g. (page 4n), "I am not sure whether this suggestion was made by Mr. (*rectius* Dr.) Astley from the official "Catalogue of Romances," which he consulted for a description of the manuscript." How witty and funny is this implication. One must, however, doubt if this is a method of seriously considering an historical problem.

I will now take the points still between us, and will gladly submit to the opinion of any impartial scholar on them. Possibly some American historian, who is not inside the Oxford historian ring, will find time to deal with them.

The facts that Hubert and his four sons existed and that the latter received great gifts have never been disputed, and, in fact, are proved up to the hilt by very numerous entries in Domesday and the early Pipe Rolls.

As to the main allegations against the Chronicle I will deal in detail, without seeking to defend either the miracles or the under-done crane story, though as to the latter my attitude is *credo quia impossibile est*, for it is abso-

†See 27n for a third instance of his treating the Chronicle as genuine.

lutely incredible that an early or late compiler would have inserted a trivial episode like this which has no bearing on his tale for the "honour and glory" of the family.

1. That the actual MS. of the Chronicle is of late date. This has never been denied. Why some one at that period thought it necessary to copy or summarize an older chronicle I don't know. In No. 5 *post*, I guess it may have been compiled about 1266.

2. That it was devised in honour of the family of Rye. This is impossible, for the baronial family had become extinct in the male line on the death, without male issue, of the last baron in 1188, and there was no one to placate, for those who afterwards bore the surname in Norfolk were only the "butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers" from whom I come myself. Nor does the Chronicle so much as mention the Mandeville's or the match with Margaret at all. Nor does it mention the stirring episode told by Wace, which has been adopted and accepted by Dugdale, Sir Henry Ellis, Sir F. Palgrave, by modern French historians, and even by Freeman, and apparently by Dr. Round, although he is discreetly silent about it. Nor, though it definitely states that Eudo's brother Adam had great possessions in Kent, does it mention that he was one of the compilers of Domesday, which is curious if it were an invention for the glorification of the family.

3. Dr. Round makes a great point that William de Pont de l'arche mentioned in the Chronicle as Treasurer at Winchester in 1087, could not have been so because the dates he can trace for him as Treasurer are between 1130 and 1144, 43 to 57 years after the episode. He might have added that he was alive in 1216!

He omits, however, to note that there was a William de Pont de l'arch, who refounded Southwark Priory in 1106 (Dug. Mon. VI., page 171), 19 years only after the episode, who may well have been the father of the William who lived between 1130 and 1144, also that Hubert de Rye and Reginald de Warrenne, his guardians, were benefactors to the same Priory (see Dodsworth MS, cii., fo. 33.

and cxxx., fo. 44). This looks to me a very bad bit of *suppressio veri*. The fact seems to be that there were two of the name, probably father and son, and that my references were to the father and many of Dr. Round's to the son.

This is shown by the fact that a charter of Henry I. (1125-1135 exemplification on the Charter Rolls, Henry III. Cal., p. 336) is directed to William de Pontearce, the sheriff, is witnessed by another W. de Pontearce!

The first man was sheriff between 1102 and 1123, but the second was in actual rebellion against King John in 1216 (Pat. Ca. (folio), p. 194). As Dr. Round says he was Treasurer (Chamberlain?) in 1130, it may be presumed he was born before 1100. This would make Dr. Round's William at least 116 years old when he was a rebel! There is, of course, utter confusion as to the dates, but it is not of my making, and the new facts I now give completely nullify Dr. Round's arguments and show that the Chronicle's statement is perfectly possible.

He also makes much of the fact that Freeman could not find the name in Domesday. Why should he? Were all the holders of offices in 1087 necessarily holders of land and may they not have been paid by salaries or allowances?

4. Now as to the Chronicler's statement that the Town in which Hubert first stayed in England called *Essec*[†] was given to him as a possession for ever.

His mission is said to have been dangerous because of the recent massacre of Normans at Guildford and, finding the little village of Ash, in Surrey, is hard by, I not unnaturally thought that was the locality in question.

The Chronicle itself gives no clue to the locality, but the gift seemed borne out by the fact, but Domesday mentions that Eudo fitz Hubert held Ash (Esse) of the King.

[†]Ash in Kent which contains Richborough Castle would seem to answer the landing place better than any other Ash.

It is true that this Ash is in Hampshire, but surely the compiler of the Chronicle did not necessarily know the county in which the Ash he mentions was situate, indeed, it would be difficult for him to find out, for there were no Gazetteers then in existence, and it is hardly likely he had access to the MS. of Domesday. The other Ash to which Dr. Round refers as being in Hants., is, moreover, not the only Ash, for there is an Ash in Kent, which was a probable place for a King to stay in.

Then there is the fact that the Ash in Surrey is on the very edge of the present border of Hampshire, and it may well be was in that County temp. D.D.B. This, however, is only a suggestion. Boundaries of hundreds may well have been unsettled about the time of Domesday, e.g., Dr. Round himself, in "Peerage and Pedigree," page 331, refers to Geoffrey de Mandeville giving land in Aulton in Surrey, but I find no place of that name in Surrey, and Alton in Hants may be meant.

And there is yet another point to consider for the "Ash" intended by the Chronicle may be the "Essa" given by Eudo to St. John, Colchester, see Confirmation Charter (Charter Roll 37, Hy. III., page 423), which the D.D. Book of Essex (Vict. Hist., page 478b) calls Ash or Ashenhall, and says it was given by Gilbert de Clare, a connection of Eudo's by marriage, to the Priory of Clare hard by only 4 years after Domesday.

The main fact to remember is that the Chronicle mentions "Ash" only, and I have shown a very early connection of the Ryes with two Ashs.

Which the Chronicler meant I neither know nor care, though I still think the Surrey Ash is more probable.

As to the Ryes holding land in England before the Conquest, which he doubts, I am not sure that it cannot be proved from Domesday itself that Eudo held land in Norfolk before Domesday.

Among the possessions of Ralph de Beaufoy (page 149 of Vict. ed, folio 226) in [Bircham] Newton, which T.R.E. was held by Tove, a freeman, were certain freemen which Eudo, predecessor of Ralph, had, Stigand having the soke.

Again in Swanton [Morley] Godwin held, and of him Ralph's predecessor had only the commendation and his soke was in Mileham, and Eudo held them and Ralph holds them of the King's gift.

Again in Deopham, Lewin, a freeman, held T.R.E., the other soke was in Hingham. Freemen were added in King William's time when Eudo held.

Now Stigand was Bishop of Elmham in 1043-1047, and this may point to Eudo being contemporary in his holding with him. Stigand's patrimony came to William de Beaufoy, afterwards Bishop of Elmham, and eventually both Bircham, Swanton Morley and Deopham came to the Ryes.

5. Dr. Round makes a great point (page 19) that William I. died at Rouen—and not at Caen—as stated by the Chronicle. This is a mistake made by the Chronicler, not by me, yet it is duly scored against me personally.

All it does prove is that the Chronicle could not have been compiled very recently after the death when the facts were fresh in everyone's minds. Possibly the completion of the original of the Chronicle was about 200 years after the Conquest.

6. The Chronicle says that Eudo's two brothers, Ralph and Hubert, had the Castles of Nottingham and Norwich "committed to them." Dr. Round states (page 17) that the keepers of both Castles were two other men, and especially quotes Ordericus to prove that the King put Nottingham Castle into the safe hands of William Peverel. "Apart from the fact that the Castle may have been first in the hands of one and then of the other, it seems to me that everything hinges on the Chronicler's expression 'were committed to.' If it means that the two brothers were the working-fighting-Castellans of the two Castles under the Sheriffs, and under the great men in charge of the County and City, the mystery is solved. No one alleges they were themselves the Sheriffs of either County, though they may have been. The materials of the period are notoriously scarce. But Ralph fitz Hubert was certainly a very large holder in capite in

Nottingham, and Ellis talks of him as holding in the burgh there, and Hubert equally certainly was also a large holder in Norfolk.

Who started the idea that the meaning of the words "committed to" was that they were Castellans I do not know, but I think that it does not necessarily bear that interpretation. Even if it does, "Castellan" has been defined as

1. The lord, owner or *captain* of the Castle. The Constable of a fortified house (Tomlin Law. Dict.)
2. The governor or *constable* of the Castle (Ainsworth).
3. The owner or *captain* of the Castle (Wright).
4. The captain, governor, *warden* or *castellan* for a castle (Latham's "Johnson").
5. The captain, keeper, governor, or *Constable* of a Castle ("Century Dictionary").

It seems to me more reasonable to suppose that the Chronicler's meaning was that the two men he named, Ralph and Hubert, were put in the position of Constables, Castellans, or Wardens of the Castles under, and subordinate to, the Sheriffs, who were the supervisors and responsible for their Counties.

That the Sheriffs were not in residential charge of the Castles, and their fighting garrisons seems clear enough from several entries in the early Pipe Rolls, e. g.,

2 Henry. II., page 14, at Cambridge, Paganus was Sheriff, but the houses of Reginald de Castello were repaired.

Id., page 43, In Shropshire William fil' Alan was Sheriff, and paid to Engelard, the Custodian of the Castle of Stratton, page 64, and again page 165 the Sheriff pays for repairs of the houses of the Castle of Cambridge

3 Hy. II., page 170, for the repairs of the Castle.

5 Hy. I., page 62, the Sheriff of Shropshire pays out £4 "in custodia Castell'i de Stratton."

6 Hy. pages 25-6, the Sheriff pays out £4 again for the same, page 25 to Roger de Powis £12 for the custody of the Castle of Ulverton, and page 29, again to him when he was the custodian of the Castle of St. Briaval. And in the Rolls of 10 and 12 Hy. II., there are other payments which clearly show that the Sheriff was not the actual "man in possession."

Consequently it appears to me that Dr. Round's main argument is built on a mare's nest.

7. My chief complaint against him, however, is the very shifty way in which he evades my direct record evidence that Hubert de Rye had a permanent and actual berth in connection with Norwich Castle†

I pointed out that Henry de Rye before his death, and certainly before 1166 gave, or purported to give, the Castellanship of Norwich Castle in a charter set out verbatim in a petition of Thomas de Bavant, about 1330, which petition is still to be seen at the P.R.O. (Ancient Petitions, No. 4635).

All that he vouchsafes to reply is that "no such charter exists." This statement is pure guesswork for it may still exist, and anyhow its exemplification at length on a petition engrossed nearly 600 years ago does exist.

He adds, "Such is Mr. Rye's idea of the strongest possible evidence and most strong corroboration." I think all impartial readers will agree with me that it is so and will leave it to them. There is, moreover, other record evidence as to the Bavants. They held 2½ Knight's fees from the Rye barony before 1166, by which date they had parted with them to Hugh Bigod, which may show that the latter bought out their interest in his castellain rights. Again, in 1325, Thomas de Bavent, the petitioner of c. 1330, had bought a house adjoining the Castle, which looks as though he had, or thought he had, some official connection with it, and almost immediately afterwards Ralph de Bavent was made Lieutenant of the Tower of London, which seems to me to be the result of some compromise.

†Later on another Henry de Rye was Castellain of Elgin and Forcys in 1292 (see Pat. Roll Cal.).

I think this evasion of positive evidence is one of the worst possible instances of the many in which Dr. Round deliberately declines seriously to contest arguments.

So much for seven points which arise out of the statements of the Chronicle itself, and I now come to a question which Dr. Round has mixed up with it, *viz.*,

8. His mistaken statement that the Chronicle stated that Geoffrey was the grandson of Eudo Dapifer was, of course, only made to help to destroy the credit of such Chronicle, and was part of the "evidence" on which he mainly founded his attack on it. Of course, it is out of the question to think he wilfully invented the statement to bolster up his antipathy to the Chronicle, but it was used for that purpose.

This, it is now admitted, came from the Tintern register—a very short and businesslike one—that Tintern was itself a Mandeville foundation, and that its chronicler might have been supposed to know something of its founders pedigree is ignored altogether by Dr. Round.

So he is left to fall back on his original tale that the Pipe Roll entries of 31 Henry I., 1130-1, show that Eudo's English properties escheated to the Crown and so that he, therefore, could not have left issue (G. de M., page 173).

A close examination of these entries does not seem to bear this out. The person who accounted for Eudo's English property was Hamo de St. Clair, his nephew, who was made Castellain of Colchester in his place (G. de M., page 52), and was accounted for its farm £190 3s. Again, it is possible that some of his possessions were attached to his office, both in Normandy and elsewhere, and passed on to his successor, or were given *en bloc* to another official, who may, or may not, have been kin to him. Warin fil' Gerold, the King's "camerarius," certainly accounted for them for many years. May not some portion of Eudo's Domesday holdings have been by way of payment for his official services, and reverted to the Crown on his death?

The match seems absolutely proved by the passage in the Empress Maud's charter, 1141-2, which refers to granting Geoffrey de Mandeville all Eudo's lands in Normandy and his dapifership "as his right," and conditionally all his English land (Round G. de M., pages 165-7) which can only mean right by descent. So, at least, thought Eyton, a far greater authority than Round.

As to the question whether Geoffrey de Mandeville was the son of Eudo Dapifer's daughter, the probabilities were all one way for both families were then of equal wealth and position, in fact Eudo was far better known than William de Mandeville, of whom Round says little.

In the alternative, there is the possibility that Margaret, daughter of Eudo, may have been the first wife of Geoffrey himself, and that the claim was through her. I put the possibility forward on page 42b, but Round apparently finds himself unable or unwilling to consider it.

Nor does Dr. Round even notice my argument (page 41) that right was not always right in those days. I cited his own statement that Ernulf de Mandeville, the son of the great Geoffrey and Roesia de Vere, was disinherited and never got his rights. Is not this the possible case of Geoffrey himself having been unfairly deprived of his rights as Eudo's heir exactly in point?

But he absolutely ignores this argument.

Nor does he condescend even to notice my suggestion ("Norwich Castle," page 49) that Geoffrey de Mandeville's real reason for going over to the Empress Maud was that he had been unable to obtain his just rights from Henry or from Stephen.

I will, however, now give two separate and wholly distinct proofs that the Mandevilles inherited Eudo's lands in London.

This does not arise from the Chronicle at all, but is a point which Dr. Round takes up at great length in his attack on my defence of it, viz., the accuracy of the state-

ment that Hubert, the father of Eudo, owned land in London before the Conquest, which is described as being in the parish of St. Mary Colchurch or Colkirk.

"Newchurch" is said by Dr. Round to have been elsewhere, viz., St. Mary, Woolchurchhaw and not St. Mary Colchurch. To prove this he quotes (1) Newcourt's "Repertorium," which was compiled at a date (1708-10) when much of the present material was not available; and (2) Dr. Armitage Robinson who, as Dean of Westminster, represents the hereditary feud between Westminster and Colchester. Luckily Dr. Round quotes the reasons for the Dean's opinion and they prove wholly and solely derived from his own opinions as to forgery, etc. It seems to me the height of effrontery for him to quote, as original and supporting arguments, statements admittedly inspired by himself.

Let this pass, however, and I will quote the authorities, both forged (?) and real, for my allegation that Eudo, and his father before him, owned a large block of land in "Cheap," abutting south on Cheap, W., on the present Ironmonger Lane, and east on the present Old Jewry—an interesting block for it includes the present Mercer's Hall, the birth-place of St. Thomas a Becket, and the site of the chapel to his memory. If I am right in my suggested identity of Theobald, the Archbishop (Becket's patron), with Theobald de Valoines, kinsman of Eudo Dapifer, this is extra proof of the identity of the place.

There can, however, be actually no doubt as to this, St. Mary Colchurch was at the corner of Cheapside and the Old Jewry. Davis "Regesta" refers to the church of St. Mary Newchurch as being in West Cheap and see No. 441.

†The error that St. Mary Colchurch was afterwards called St. Mary Woolchurch seems to have originated by some one having endorsed two charters B.2110 and B.2112 (which in their bodies refer to St. Mary Colchurch) "Wolchurch." This may have misled Newcourt if indeed these recent endorsements are not in his own hand.

Others charters are :-

(a) In No. 278, Mr. Davis refers to a confirmation (1085-7) to (Maurice) Bishop of London, of the gift of Alward, of London, of the church of St. Mary Newchurch, and points out that there is, with one omission, the same list of witnesses as a forged charter of 1080-5, but gives no opinion whether the charter No. 278 is forged or not.

(b) In 306 is another (duplicate?) charter (1087-8) of confirmation to St. Peter, of Westminster, of the Church called Newchurch, as Alward the clerk had given it.

(c) In No. 454 is another confirmation (1087-1100) to St. Peter of Westminster of the Church of St. Mary, Newchurch, as given by Alward of London.

(d) No. 441 is a confirmation (1087-1100), the authenticity of which Mr. Davis states has been challenged, of (i.-a) the Church of Nieuwe Church to St. John's, Colchester, from Eudo Dapifer, whose foundation Charter of Colchester is set out in Dugdale VI., page 602, states he gave the Church of St. Mary, of West Cheping, with the consent of the priest placed in it there by his ancestor, Hubert.

a, b and c are, of course, the title deeds of the Abbey of Westminster, and d of the Abbey of Colchester.

But on investigation of how the property actually passed, we come to these facts which absolutely prove that Eudo's London property passed to the Mandeville's.

Ancient Deeds A. 1988 is a grant (1213-1216) from Geoffrey de Mandeville, Earl of Essex and Gloucester, of land with buildings at the corner of Ysmonger Lane in the parish of St. Mary Colechurch, to Gilbert de Walton. This was witnessed by William de Mandeville.

Ancient Deeds A. 2022 is a release dated 1220-1 from Gilbert de Walton of the property, in the parish of St. Mary, which Sir Geoffrey de Mandeville gave him.

Ancient Deeds A. 13423, is a release by a Jew, dated about 1227, of a house in the Market of W. Cheap, which was of his grandfather, which Geoffrey fil' Peter, Earl of Essex had, and which Gilbert de Walton had of the gift of Geoffrey de Mandeville, son and heir of the same Geoffrey fil' Peter.

Ancient Deed A. 2073, is a grant dated 1232-3 by Master Alexr. de Dorset to the Prior and Canons of Holy Trinity, London, of houses in the parish of St. Mary Colechurch, at the corner of Ysmonger Lane, to support a Canon, etc., reserving (i.a.) to Geoffrey de Mandeville Earl of Essex, a yearly rental of a tercel or four besants.

On Charter Roll 37, Henry III. (1253 Cal., page 423), is a Confirmation by the King, to St. John, Colchester, of i.-a., lands, etc., given them by Eudo Dapifer, and i.a., the Church of St. Mary de Newchurch, London. This is absolute proof of the identity of the Church of St. Mary Colechurch and St. Mary Newchurch.

Afterwards this Cheap property came into the possession of the Priory of the Holy Trinity, beside Aldgate, London, and was dealt with by such Priory as can be seen by a long series of deeds in the Ancient Deeds carrying on the identity minutely at a late period.

My second proof that the Mandevilles succeeded to Eudo's London property is a Charter of Geoffrey Fitz Piers, who died about 1213, and who had married Beatrix de Say, niece of the great Geoffrey de Mandeville, by which he gave Shouldham Priory, in Norfolk, his 12 shops with rooms over them in the parish of St. Mary Colchyrch, London. See Bl. Norfolk VIII., p. 418, quoting Charter in the possession of Sir Thos. Hare who seems also to have owned other charters confirming gifts in London†

†No doubt Dr. Round will again sneer at me for quoting Blomefield, but the original charters are not available. Blomefield by the way had the bad taste to ante-date by 200 years or so Dr. Round's startling discovery of the identity of William of Norwich with William de Cheyny.

If the contention that the church belonged to the Abbey of Westminster had been right, how is it that such Abbey never obtained it? The powers that were apparently believed and acted on the "forged" charters, or some compromise may have been arranged, for I see the Abbot of Westminster had a portion of the tithes in Shouldham in 1428.

If further proof that the Mandevilles succeeded to property once of Eudo were necessary I could tender the fact that Eudo once held Sawbridgeworth, which afterwards passed to the Mandevilles. Also that Geoffrey de Mandeville claimed in Pledgdon lands which Eudo had held (D.D. Book of Essex, page 494), as mentioned in my Norwich Castle, page 42, but ignored by Round.

All the authorities cited above are well known to Dr. Round and were cited in my pamphlet, but he is silent as to my arguments founded on them. *Suppressio veri* may be a useful weapon but it recoils when detected.

I think, therefore, I am justified in saying that Dr. Round's main points, which he thought were so "crushingly decisive" against the Chronicle, have all failed.

CHAPTER III.

In making the remarks I am about to make as to Dr. Round's methods, I will take the opportunity of freely admitting he is the most accurate historical writer we have ever had or likely to have, and that his six volumes of the G. de M. series are most valuable, that his "Rotuli de Dominabus," his prefaces to the Pipe Rolls, his "Documents relating to France," and his new edition of the "Testa de Nevill," are, and will be, absolutely indispensable to all historical and topographical writers. What he tells you may be accepted as positive fact in 9 cases out of 10, which is an enormous boon to the minor worker.

It is his methods, his reticence of facts which don't suit him to disclose, and his evasion of argument which are objectionable, and he is also too apt to consider himself omniscient and to venture into fields which he does not understand.

His own meticulous accuracy is, as he boasts, owing to his always verifying each reference thrice, a process impossible to anyone who has other things to do than to fill the roll of a captious critic—and who cannot afford paid help.

But though his facts are usually so extremely accurate, he seems to have little power to deduce arguments from them or to appreciate facts put forward by others, so as an historian he fails in all but accuracy. Babbage's Calculating machine is most reliable, but a Chancellor of the Exchequer would hardly get much inspiration from it when framing a Budget.

He is, however, not absolutely free from error. Of the few mistakes he has made the first is the worst, viz :

1. His allegation that the Colchester Chronicle made the statement as to Geoffrey de Mandeville's descent from Eudo is absolutely untrue. The Chronicle does not even mention Geoffrey's name and the statement came from the Chronicle of Tintern. I don't believe for a moment that he invented the statement to damage the credit of the Chronicle, so can only suppose it was a bona-fide mistake, though a very bad one.

There are, however, other obvious mistakes, some of which are far more important than the very trivial slips of which he has convicted me.

2. Why, in the article on Norman influence in London ("Commune of London," p. 245-6), does he refer to Richer de l'Aigle as the youthful friend of Becket? He means the friend of the youthful Becket.

3. In *Peerage Studies* (in "Peerage and Family History," p. 318) he erroneously says that the Buxtons of Shadwell "most properly" bore a coat entirely distinct from that of the Derbyshire Buxtons, viz.: arg. a lion ram: sa tail elevated and raised over the head.

Most improperly is the fact. The Shadwell family had a grant of 2 bars with a canton, etc., in 1574, and the lion rampant was dragged in later when the family came into possession of a very curious achievement of a Seneschal de Buxton who had nothing to do with them. (See "Norfolk Families," p. 86, and the "Ancestor," No. 6).

4. Again, he wrote in the "Complete Peerage" (2nd ed., vol. ii., p. 604) that Edward II. on his accession (1307) gave the office of Steward to his uncle Edmond. His uncle had died in 1296. Of course Dr. Round meant Edward I., and to say the latter gave his brother the Stewardship.

Considering the relative importance of the subject such an error greatly outweighs my poor little omissions to cross my t's and dot my i's, of which he makes so much, and can well be set off against my undue prolongation of the reign of Henry I.

5. Again, in his "Peerage and Family History," pp. 354-5 he treats two summonses to Parliament of Thomas and Gregory Cromwell as genuine instead of forgeries.

6. In "Feudal England," p. 57, in adding up the hides and virgates of Sutton he is half a hide out. The figures add up to 9: 2½ not 9: 0½. That this is not a mere printer's error is proved by the fact that, two lines lower, the fraction of 7/80 is based on his mistake in addition.

A similar error occurs in *Domesday Studies*, p. 216, lines 7-10, where five-tenths should be five-twelfths.

7. On p. 61, line 15, again he prints Hertford when he means Hereford.

8. In "Geoffrey de Mandeville" (p. 311), Gervase de Cornhill is wrongly called Geoffrey 5 lines further down.

9. He makes Gervase de Cornhill son of Roger nepos Huberti, but Pipe Roll, 31 Hy. II. (1184) refers to Gervase and his father Henry.

10. In several places he purports to correct my grammar, but in "Feudal England," p. 60, he writes "assessments was."

Of course these are very trivial slips, and even with the miscalling Dr. Astley four times and confusing Beckham with Belram only make up a dozen errors in all his voluminous works, or about a fifth of the number of those he thinks he has convicted me in one hastily printed pamphlet.

It is not, however, of his accuracy but of his manners and customs in carrying on a dispute that so many complain. His methods of controversy are very simple. He ignores most of his adversaries' arguments and reiterates his own *ad nauseam*. His adversaries' slips of by-gone years are gloated over. If a monastic chronicle doesn't suit him to call it a silly fiction, though he is not above using portions of it when they suit him† If a charter doesn't fit in with his views it is a forgery. Who can't write history on these terms?

In controversy he permits himself the use of violent abuse as will be seen by referring to some samples in the Appendix. He attacks me for my remarking on Freeman's errors and says my remarks are "inconsistent with the decencies of controversy." If ever there was a case of Satan rebuking sin this is one! No one has ever attacked and insulted Freeman more than he has himself done, e.g., in "Peerage and Pedigree," i., p. 202, he

†In his "Feudal England," p. 470, he admits that the Colchester Chronicle was the sole evidence for the real parentage of Bishop William Gifford, and on the same page decides in favour of the Colchester narrative on another point. Again in "Domesday Studies," pp. 129-130, he actually quotes the Chronicle as an authority on a fiscal point.

talked of Freeman being guilty of a "passionate attack which was couched in language of vulgar violence," and added (id., p. 247) "and yet there are those who still believe in Professor Freeman's accuracy."

Are these within the "decencies of controversy?" But because it suits him in an isolated case to use Freeman as a stick to beat me with, he becomes his temporary champion, ignoring the great number of times he has himself corrected him in the most offensive way (see Appendix, Sub F).

Another thing against his being considered a real historian is that his general assumption of omniscience is almost past belief, for example:—

(1) What does he know about architecture? Yet he boldly denounces Mr. G. T. Clark, whose work on Castles is a most valuable text book, as a sadly careless and inaccurate archaeologist.

Perhaps, however, he was right to follow the dignified silence with which one distinguished antiquary, he has so long criticised and abused, has treated his attacks. Unluckily, however, I cannot bring myself to follow their examples, and if a man hits me I must hit back.

2. I do not know what pretensions Dr. Round has to think himself a herald—certainly the one instance he gives of his knowledge is a mistake (see Buxton arms, page 26), but in his "Peerage and Pedigree" (ii., pages 307-384), under the heading of "Heraldry and the Gentry" he makes a lengthy excursion (77 pages) *apropos de rien* into Heraldry aimed at those who have thought it right to do the straight thing and apply for new grants of arms rather than use unauthorised arms stolen by their immediate ancestors.

†This expression, like its variant, used by Mr. Oswald Barron, the heraldic gent, of course implying that the recipient of a grant is not a gentleman, is not even original. When I was Hon. Secretary of the London Athletic Club half a century ago and took a strong part in the endeavour to keep the gentleman amateur athlete separate from the uneducated and rough amateur, a clever little Jew professional runner, who afterwards rose to edit the "Referee," invented and continually used the description of "amateur gentleman" for the better class runners. This was much neater and more offensive than the present expression

On page 313, Dr. Round says that most persons considered the assumption of the arms of one family by the members of another a venial offence, adding, however, that "those of us, however, who cared for genealogical work would gladly have seen this abuse denounced and checked."

Why, therefore, has he not denounced his own ancestors?

According to Burke his family was established in Essex by James Round, of London, "esq.," in 1726. He was really a London stationer. No arms are ascribed to the name in any Ordinary, English or foreign, and Edward Round, of London, ironmonger, disclaimed them in 1687. As the family grew wealthy they calmly annexed the arms of Halwell, of Deven, viz., Arg. on a chevron gu. 3 annulets or. Whether this coat was supposed to come from some female ancestor I know not, but the name does not appear at all on the pedigree shewn in Burke.

Quite recently James Round, the M.P. for Essex, having discovered that he had no right to these arms very properly took a grant in 1871 of Arg., on a chevron cotised sa 3 pellets or, charged with an annulet of the second—a Herald's variation† of the old stolen coat of Halwell. This coat was limited to issue of himself and of his uncle, Joseph Green Round, of Bird Hill, and does not include or cover Dr. Round.

As Dr. Round was then (in 1871) only 17, it may be presumed that he had no part in the taking out of this grant by his cousin, from which he was omitted, the

†This is a usual, but I think an improper, recent custom of the College, and, of course, is only meant to let the sinner down easily.

‡In another place, "Peerage and Family History" (1901), he seems to go even further and says, "There is no law in existence against such (pirate) arms being borne. It is probable that County families who have borne them as such for generations will continue to do so, and that prominent people, whose social position is undoubted, may even esteem more highly the arms their ancestors have borne than those which a retired trader has lately been induced to purchase."

result being that Burke's "Landed Gentry" correctly omits arms for him (I think the only instance of such in the whole work). He has, therefore, no coat, good, bad or indifferent, on which to hang that of his ancestor, the "representative of the Wilmots, Earl of Rochester." His position in armory is that of Mahomet's coffin. Whether the omission, first from the new grant, and secondly from "Burke," affords a reason for his continual and bitter attacks both on the Herald's College and Burke may be conjectured.

The curious part is that this long article of 74 pages seems only to have been written to defend his own ancestors, who, no doubt he considers belong to the "county family and established position," from the charge of being plebeian (p. 315) and on p. 317 he unfairly quotes Fuller's retort of an ancient esquire "I must fain wear the coat which my great great grandfather left me," which he apparently considers applies to his own great great grandfather who annexed the Halwell coat.

No one wishes to deny that the family of Round of Essex has for some years been a "County Family" in the modern sense of the word, though they do not appear as such till 1849. They were highly respectable, having filled the office of High Sheriff, having been bankers of credit and renown, and twice M.P.s, and finally they have earned the gratitude of all antiquaries by saving Colchester Castle from destruction, a fact which Dr. Round, who is only a cadet of this family and whose branch did not contribute to the purchase, seems to consider, gives him a proprietary right to warn off all but himself from discussing its history.

However respectable they may have been, very little was known of them and their pedigree till quite lately, for Berry's so-called Visitation of Essex, 1838, was unable to give the name of the father of Jas. Round, the stationer (p. 699) and, I speak under correction, I think the family pedigree was first put before the public in the columns of that very Burke's "Landed Gentry," which Dr. Round

has so frequently and offensively criticised, where the account of both branches is comprised in rather more than one column.

As I am one of those he impliedly sneers at for taking a grant, I will say that my reasons for doing so were very simple. Distant cousins of mine and especially the Rev. C. B. Jermyn, a Suffolk antiquary of repute, assumed our descent from the Baronial family, and used to quarter their coat freely. When I went into the matter I satisfied myself that though there was every probability of the descent, there was no legal proof of it, so dropped all pretensions to arms and like the head of the Round family applied for a grant.

This I did chiefly because, being a writer on Norfolk pedigrees, a publisher of heraldic books and a critic of other people's coats, I thought it hardly decent for me to accuse people of wrongly bearing arms while I was not entitled myself to do so.

(3) Again, when he leaves the safe paths of historical genealogy in the "Commune of London" (1889, p. 1-17) to make a wild dash into the origin of place names and purports to correct Stubbs, Green, and Kemble, as to the meanings of the use of the terminations ingham, etc., he ignores entirely my much earlier, and I venture to think, more plausible theory, which I had set out 14 years earlier in my "History of Norfolk" (1885, p. 11) that it is more reasonable† to think that place-names like Mannington, Gimingham, Briningham, and so on, were simply intended to mean the town or village of the settlers from Manning, or Brining, places beyond the sea in which such settlers lived†

†This explanation did not find favour among philologists for it was too simple for them, so it has been ignored, as have been the facts I gave of the existence of many places in Scandinavia (e.g., Lunden), and especially up the Thames Valley, which seems to me to prove a very early invasion of the Northmen long before the Roman invasion and the pirate raids of the more recent Danes.

That it is the custom of invading and settling nations to transplant their own place names is, however, too great a truism to be denied.

(4) As to his, and others, not having the real historical sense, etc., an example of the danger of stay-at-home students of the art of war is afforded by the way in which he, Professor Oman, and Mr. Archer tumbled over one another in the heated discussion as to the Battle of Hastings. They seemed unable first to understand Wace's narrative, and secondly, to see its many inconsistencies and absurdities.

Wace's "Chronicle of the Norman Conquest" (ed. Taylor, 1837), p. 198, states that at Hastings the Normans finding the English had so covered themselves with their shields that the arrows could not reach their bodies . . . determined to shoot their arrows upwards into the air so that they might fall on their enemies' heads and strike their faces; and (i.e.) shot Harold above the right eye and put it out.

This seems to me ridiculous, for any practical archer knows that arrows shot upwards in the air when they have exhausted their initial momentum will at last poise and, on turning over and falling, will have no penetrating power beyond what they gained from their fall to the ground. They might have hurt a man if they hit him in the up-turned eye, as it is said one did Harold, but would have no more war effect than a light cane would have if dropped from the top of a house.

This point seems to have been overlooked by all previous writers on the subject, and very materially affects the credibility of Wace's description of the battle.

These statements have been accepted as gospel by all writers on the Battle, but these give no explanation of the methods though they argue lengthily about them. ("Commune of London").

Probably not one of the three disputants had ever held a sword or loosed an arrow since childhood, and yet they discussed the subject as though they had been trained soldiers accustomed to the use of weapons.

The construction of the shield wall is perfectly simple to any practical man. If each shield had a twist of iron like a ram's horn, which would hitch into a similar one on his next door neighbour's shield, the whole mystery would be solved. The wall of shields clinging together would mechanically form a shield wall not to be easily broken up by a frontal attack.

Another point which the disputants missed was the notable absence of any relics of the battle; skeletons, weapons, armour, and the like, which seems to point to the fight being fought by far smaller forces than generally supposed.

(5) I know that Dr. Round considers that he has a thorough knowledge of the theory of Castle guard service, but I have been unable to get him to see the absolute absurdity of supposing that, excepting at very early times, physical service supposed to be rendered, often hundreds of miles away, was absolutely impossible, and that it must have been compounded for by cash payments.

As to Dr. Round's attack on me for inaccuracies, I regret that I must "admit the fact and mock it." I have now issued just over a hundred various antiquarian books, mostly works of reference, and it would be strange indeed if I had not made many errors, but to my credit may be placed that, among other things, I was the first to issue Calendars of the Feet of Fines for Norfolk, and to follow them up with similar Calendars for Cambridge and Suffolk, for the compilation and printing of which I mostly paid out of my own pocket, that I inspired the Calendar of Surrey Fines, have calendared very many early, Norwich Deeds, and have issued my "Norfolk Families," and printed three Armories. Had I been as well to do as he is, I should probably have shown as good a record as he has done. Nor should it be forgotten that his life has been one of studious and unrestricted leisure, whereas I have worked very hard at my own profession, at athletics, and on other subjects.

DR. J. H. ROUND'S RECENT ATTACK ON MR. WALTER RYE

Nearly a quarter of a century before he began to write seriously I had been issuing from 1878 articles of destructive pedigree analysis in the "Genealogist" and elsewhere as to the Squire forgeries, the Howard, Steward, Bacon, and many other pedigrees.

I do not claim to have invented the system of both showing a pedigree wrong in itself and then showing what it really should be, for this was begun by Beltz in his review of the Chandos Peerage Case (1834), but I used it 23 years before Dr. Round followed me in 1902.

While fully admitting the great value of his work in getting together material for future historians, I cannot see that he is a great historian himself.

He has done much and most valuable work, but much of it in a very detached and intermittent way. His published volumes are of very varying merit, for though they contain much that is very useful, there is also much which is obscure and controversial.

If by his successfully controverting high legal luminaries, who have floundered in the mysteries and gibberish of Peerage Law, see his references to the "wise men of Gotham," "Gilbertian situation," "tied themselves in a fresh and frightful knot," "in his Muddle of the Law" ("Peerage and Pedigree" i., p. 157, etc.), he has used his influence in persuading the Government to proceed with the publication of a much wanted new edition of the "Testa de Nevill," all I can say is that I wish him more power to his elbow.

It may, however, be asked what he, with ample means and a life of unhappily enforced leisure, has done to help his fellow-workers beyond correcting other people's errors and issuing three valuable reference works.

These do not purport to be printed at his own expense, and I do not know if they were so.

DR. J. H. ROUND'S RECENT ATTACK ON MR. WALTER RYE

In any case the cost of producing them compares but poorly with the enormous expense incurred by men like G.E.C. in printing his monumental "Peerage and Baronetage," by the latter's successor, Mr. Gibbs, or even with the late Dr. Copinger's voluminous indexes on Suffolk, which render a future history of that County a possibility.

However, I have, perhaps, dealt too lengthily with the whole subject and will leave it to present and future readers to express their opinions. If he will answer my seven main points on the reliability of the Colchester Chronicle in any paper which will give me a right of reply, I shall be happy to join issue with him again, otherwise I must be silent, for I cannot afford the luxury of another pamphlet.

At present I think most readers will agree with me that he has not crushingly "crushed" either the Chronicle or me.

I have been told that I should not defend myself because my opponent considers himself dangerously ill, but I am eleven years older than he, am worn-out with hard work and my eyesight is fast failing, so I do not see why I should sit down and be silent under the violent attack he has made.

WALTER RYE.

APPENDIX I.

I here append a few specimens of the way Dr. Round has attacked his fellow-workers and past authorities. It must not be supposed that I seek to contest the justice of much of the criticism which I have set out. What I protest against is the violent and offensive language in which it is couched. As Chevalier in one of his Victorian ballads says "It's not exactly what he says, but the nasty way he says it."

Alison the Historian—"A solemn Scottish writer probably hoaxed," P. and F.H., p. 26.

Archer—"Obviously impossible date," C. of L., p. 310. "Feeble evasion," F.E., p. 347. "Exact converse of the truth," id. 349. "Can only be described as dishonest," F.E., p. 394.

Armitage, Mrs.—"Much contradiction and error," unproved hypothesis, curious looseness, large proportion of contradiction and error, grave heresy, confusion of thought, and see Review in English Historical Review, xxvii., July, 1912.

Asquith, H. H.—His "dogmatic fashion" (P. & P. i., p. 162). "His unemotional mind," p. 200. "The extreme confidence of Mr. Asquith's unfortunate assertions," p. 281. "Only Mr. Asquith's little way. Bold assertion is one thing: proof is quite another," p. 277.

Baigent, F. J.—"Absolutely amazing statements," P. and P. ii., p. 104.

Baring-Gould—"Wild and baseless," as "silly a statement as . . ." P. and P. i., p. xiv.

Betham, Sir William—"Certificate an absolute falsehood," P. and F.H., p. 21.

Birch, W. de C.—"Description is most unfortunate, being not only inaccurate but misleading," F.E., p. 6. "But even repeated Ellis' blunder," F.E., p. 169. "This cardinal error vitiates his elaborate argument, and,

indeed, makes confusion worse confounded," G. de M., p. 59. "The startling error," id. p. 71. His "two original and quite incomprehensible errors," id. p. 73. His "unfortunate discovery," p. 73. His "demonstrably erroneous hypotheses," id. p. 77.

Bird, W. H. B.—"Reckless guesswork," P. and P. ii., p. 66. (Mr. Bird in the "Ancestor," No. 12, had supported the Trafford pedigree against Dr. Round's attacks).

Brewer, Dr.—"Rightly or wrongly enjoyed a great reputation . . . incredible that he should so misread the grant" (P. & F.H., p. 39). His "inexplicable blunder," P. & P. ii., p. 274. "Stereotyped and carried further Carew's error," C. of L., p. 146. "Further failure," C. of L., p. 149.

Burke, Sir H. F. (now Garter), son of Sir Bernard Burke.—"The Botoiph fiction appears in Burke's Peerage, not as a relic of a careless age, but as the result, in 1900, of 'a more thorough revision than usual' of its pages." P. & F.H., p. 53. "Idiotic anachronism," id. 90n. "Weird beliefs on the subject of our public records," P. and P. i., p. 49.

Camden.—"Led by the error," C. of L., p. 313.

Carew, Sir George—"Most untrustworthy antiquary," C. of L., p. 146.

Carlyle, T. Irvyng.—"Grotesque interpolated history as she is taught at Lincoln College, Oxford, and as Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, doubtless a distinguished historian."

Clark, G. T.—"A sadly careless and inaccurate archæologist," P. and P. i., p. 47.

Cokayne, G. E.—"Such violent language as this is not only excessive, but is a subject for regret," P. and F.H., p. 23.

[Satan, I believe, rebuked sin!] "Hopelessly behind the times," P. and F.H., p. 9,

- Coke, Lord Chief Justice.—"Crowned his muddle," P. and P. i., p. 180. "His usual careless inaccuracy," p. 183. "Lamentably loose in his language," id., p. 186.
- Copinger, W. A.—"Greatly daring . . . a most audacious statement," P. and P. ii., p. 143. "For a very vulgar and personal attack on his surroundings," id., p. 158.
- Dugdale.—"Terribly at sea," G. de M., p. 327.
- Earle, Professor.—His "equation seems to be most surprising," C. of L., p. 15.
- Edwards.—"The editor of the *Liber* de Hyda made in the Preface . . . the almost incredibly foolish remark," P. and P. ii., p. 293.
- Ellis, Sir Henry.—"Can scarcely have read his own document," "Extraordinary assertion," F.E., p. 59. "Mistaken," id., p. 140.
- Eyton.—"Strange theory," P. and P. ii., p. 26. "Gravely erred," G. de M., p. 44. "Strangely misunderstood," G. de M., p. 290. "Ignoring this valuable and most important feature," F.E., p. 17. "Fanciful calculations . . . fatal error," F.E., p. 64. "Great masses of Mr. Eytton's work consist of similar guesses and assumptions," "inextricably confused . . . never be sure if one is dealing with facts or fancies," "Further and fundamental error," F.E., p. 114.
- Fox-Davies, A. C.—"Frightful nonsense," P. & P. i., p. 16. xvi. "Merely grotesque," p. 324. "Wild imagination," p. 328. "Blunders which betrays his ignorance, carelessness or haste," P. & P. ii., p. 339. "Incorrigible lack of accuracy," p. 347. "Frightful hash," p. 363.
- Freeman.—"Passionate attack which was couched in language of vulgar violence," P. & P. pp. 201-2. "Amazing errors," p. 202. "Persistent error," p. 333. "And yet there are those who still believe in Professor Freeman's accuracy," p. 247. "Came to utter grief," F.E., p. 169. "Ready acceptance of even glaring improbabilities," F.E., p. 386. "Follow blindly," p. 391.

- "Never learnt and never forgot," p. 395. "Formed an idea, and then under its spell, fitted the facts to it," id., p. 322. "Notoriously the very last man to go himself to records," P. and P. i.; similar slips see G. de M., pp. 2, 78. "Not merely failed to grasp the question at issue but has also strangely contradicted himself," G. de M., p. 16. "Certainly wrong," G. de M., p. 294. "Carelessly confused," C. of L., p. 31. "Trapped by fierce prejudices," P. and F. H., p. 152. "Erred from his careless reading of Domesday," F.E., p. 152. "Formed an idea and then . . . fitted the facts to it without question," F.E., p. 322. "Wholly misconceived," p. 381. "Ready acceptance of glaring improbabilities," F.E., p. 386. "Did he ever learn to distinguish conjecture from fact?" F.E., p. 435. "Fertile imagination," F.E., p. 438. "Loose expressions," C. of L., p. 34. "Did not understand scientific genealogy," "The assertion . . . is absolutely contrary to fact," P. & F.H., pp. 5 and 67. "Language of vulgar violence," P. & P. i., p. 201. "Amazing outburst," p. 201. "Came so terribly to grief," P. & P. i., p. 247.
- Gardiner.—"Too confused," P. and F.H., p. 368. "It is too difficult to comment on this note in language that would not be indecorous," P. and F.H., p. 368. "So confused its evidence," p. 374. "Singular inaccuracy or carelessness," p. 378. "His arguments are not consistent while his treatment . . . has been neither critical nor exact," P. and F.H., xxix.
- Green.—His statement as to 60,000 knight fees "ludicrously remote from the truth," C. of L., p. 289.
- Haldane.—"Frightful confusion," P. and P. i., p. 119. "Betrays an amazing misapprehension of the very nature of serjeanty," id., p. 122.
- Hall, Hubert.—"Confused and wild guesswork . . . the means of imparting wanton heresy and error," C. of L., p. xv. Also see studies on the Red Book, printed for private circulation only, id. xvin. "Meaning is as usual obscure," C. of L., p. 205. "Make one

- read with absolute amazement," id, p. 271. "Returns . . . lamentably misunderstood by their official editor," C. of L., p. xiv. "Untrustworthy character of," Genal. ii., p. 168. "Official edition worse than useless." "Marred throughout by that confusion of thought," C. of L., p. 206. "Unhappy inability to understand or to describe accurately," C. of L., p. 84. "Strange capacity of inventing difficulties, . . . mental twist which distorts the writer's vision, etc.," id, p. 135. "Really lamentable," id, p. 136. "Whether such editing should be styled a farce or a burlesque," id, p. 313. "Singularity infelicitous 'shot,'" P. & P. i., p. 153.
- Hamilton, N. E. S. A.—"Jumped at this conclusion," F.E., p. 10. "Strange comment," id, p. 12.
- Jeaffreson, J. C.—"Ignorance of," F.E., p. 466.
- Jessopp, Dr.—"Amazing production . . . hardly imagine that an educated man would write such toady stuff," P. & P. ii., pp. 9-10.
[This attack was written in 1910 when Dr. Jessopp was 87 years of age, and was gallantly striving to supplement his income, which had been very greatly impaired by the death of his wife and his inability to perform the duties of his rectory.]
- Kemble.—"Worthless lists," C. of L., p. 24. "It can hardly be disputed that Kemble's lists are merely a pitfall for the unwary," id, p. 25. "Climax of his derivations is reached," id, p. 24.
- Lang, Andrew.—"Has erected yet another edifice," C. of L., p. 21. "Will not stand examination," id, p. 22.
- Loftie.—"Wild confusion," C. of L., p. 105.
- Lower, M. A.—"A somewhat uncritical and frivolous genealogist," P. and P. ii., p. 45.
- Maitland, Professor.—"Mistaken . . . confused," C. of L., p. 257.
- Nicolas, Sir Harris.—"Only shows that he could not think clearly," P. and P. i., p. 171.

- Norgate, Miss Kate.—"Betrays a singular confusion of ideas," F.E., p. 276. "Characteristic quibble," F.F. p. 362.
- Oman, Professor.—"Frightful confusion into which Mr. Oman has been led by his double blunder," C. of L., p. 59. "Has actually given in succession four entirely different descriptions . . . while he has not the candour to confess that he has ever changed his mind," C. of L., p. 48. "Topsy-turvy . . . hopelessly confused," C. of L., p. 61. "Astounding inaccuracy," id, p. 296. "Has not even grasped so elementary a fact," C. of L., p. 296. "A further instance of his grievous lack of accuracy," id, p. 296. "Endless contradiction . . . we need a guide who knows at least his own mind, and whose 'cocksureness' is not proportionate to the mutability of his views," id, p. 301. [I presume this is one of the "decencies of controversy" he now recommends me to adopt!]
- Palgrave, Sir Francis.—"Brilliant imagination," F.E., p. 434.
- Parker, L. N.—"I declined to aid and abet Mr. Louis Napoleon Parker in making history ridiculous by connecting myself in any way with the Colchester Pageant of 1909," P. and P. i., p. 306.
- Pearson.—"Resorting to the ingenious devices of apocalyptic interpretation," F.E., p. 293.
- Rye, W.—Nothing but complimentary till 1921.
- Seeböhm.—"Mr. Seeböhm's error," C. of L., p. 14.
- Selborne, Lord.—"Curiously weak attempt," P. & P. i., p. 257.
- Sharpe, Dr.—"Erroneous" view of, C. of L., p. 239.
- Shirley, E. P.—"Careless . . . in his acceptance of authorities," P. and P. i., p. 48.
- Stapleton.—"Gone utterly astray," F.E., p. 186.
- Stevenson, W. H.—"Sheer imagination," C. of L., p. 34. "Incomprehensible error," id, p. 24. "Erroneous conclusions," id, p. 25.

DR. J. H. ROUND'S RECENT ATTACK ON MR. WALTER RYE

- Stubbs.—His "... strange delusions," G. de M., p. 270.
Tindal, Chief Justice.—"Alleged facts are found to be grotesque errors," P. & P. i., p. 142. "So amazing a blunder," id, p. 143. "Cribbed from Cruise." "Amazing want of care," id, p. 142.
Tucker, Stephen.—"A dodge which Mr. Tucker, a professional herald, deemed sound heraldry," P. & P. ii., p. 210.
Vinogradoff.—"Equally misled," F.E., p. 105.
Wiffen.—"Of all those who have been concerned in this egregious imposture Mr. Wiffen was, I fear, the worst, P. and F. H., p. 275.
Yeatman, Pym.—His strange history of the House of Arundel," G. de M., p. 20.
York, Powell.—"Not known as an authority on these works, and who is hostile to myself because I exposed Mr. Freeman!" C. of L., p. 54.

ABBREVIATIONS.

- C. of L.—"Commune of London."
F.E.—"Feudal England."
G. de M.—"Geoffrey de Mandeville."
P. and F.H.—"Peerage and Family History."
P. and P.—"Peerage and Pedigree."

MSH # 22352

**END OF
TITLE**